

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ANDERSON/GREENWOOD DIVISION

Astrin Gordon and Teddy's Paw Pet)	Case No. 8:23-cv-04967-DCC
Goods, LLC,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
Mercedes Benz USA,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

This matter is before the Court for review of the Complaint. ECF No. 1. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), (D.S.C.), this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Kevin F. McDonald for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation ("Report"). On October 17, 2023, and November 21, 2023, the Magistrate Judge directed Plaintiff Gordon to provide certain documents to bring this case into proper form for further evaluation and possible service of process and reminded her that she cannot represent the corporate Plaintiff. ECF Nos. 9, 11. Plaintiff Gordon failed to respond to either order and no attorney has made an appearance on behalf of the corporate Plaintiff.

On December 7, 2024, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that this action be dismissed without prejudice pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure

41(b) for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with an order of the court.¹ ECF No. 16. The Magistrate Judge advised the Plaintiff Gordon of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences for failing to do so. Plaintiff Gordon did not file objections to the Report, and the time to do so has lapsed.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. See *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The Court will review the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” (citation omitted)).

After considering the record in this case, the applicable law, and the Report of the Magistrate Judge, the Court finds no clear error and agrees with the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, this action is dismissed without prejudice, without

¹ The Magistrate Judge further notes that this action would be subject to summary dismissal even if it had been brought into proper form.

leave to amend, and without issuance of service of process pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Donald C. Coggins, Jr.
United States District Judge

April 30, 2024
Spartanburg, South Carolina